



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

WT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/370,776 08/09/99 KUBOTA T 450108-4457

020999 WM31/0911  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG  
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.  
NEW YORK NY 10151

EXAMINER
----------

MEISLAHN, D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2132  
DATE MAILED:

6  
09/11/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/370,776

Applicant(s)  
Kubota et al.

Examiner  
Douglas Meislahn

Art Unit  
2132



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-122 is/are pending in the applica

4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from considera

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 120-122 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☒ Claims 8-119 are subject to restriction and/or election requirem

## Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 3

20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2132

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-7 and 120-122, drawn to scrambling data, classified in class 380, subclass 212.
  - II. Claims 8-11, drawn to a multiplexing device with switches, classified in class 370, subclass 352.
  - III. Claims 12-119, drawn to encoding and scrambling broadcast information, classified in class 380, subclass 212.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because group I does not require encoding. The subcombination has separate utility such as formatting data.
3. Inventions I or III and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention II has separate utility such as routing packets. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Art Unit: 2132

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. During a telephone conversation with William Frommer on 27 April 2000 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 1-7 and 120-122. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 12-119 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 2132

***Claim Objections***

9. Claim 2 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 1-7, 121 and 122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

12. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said corresponding transport stream packet of data element" in the last clause of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

13. Claim 2 recites the limitation "said program" at the end of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This has been interpreted as "said program data."

14. Claim 121 recites the limitation "said enciphered scramble key" in the third line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The word "enciphered" should be added to claim 120 or removed from the offending phrase in claim 121.

Art Unit: 2132

15. Claim 122 recites the limitation "said enciphered work key" in the third line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This claim has been treated as though it depended from claim 121 (not 120) and the word "enciphered" was not there.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

16. Claims 1-5 and 120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wasilewski (5420866).

Wasilewski's second figure shows stream data going from one site to another. Element 120 of figure 6 shows descrambling, which reads on applicant's scrambling means in claim 1. A descrambler necessitates a key, which would necessarily have been created. Elements 122-130 of figure 6 meet the limitations of claim 3, with element 126 reading on applicant's subaudio data. Claim 4 is met in the event that there is only one packet. Elements 154 and 156 of figure 7A show that a correspondence table is used along with packet identifiers to aid in the descrambling, thereby anticipating claim 5.

17. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 120-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bando et al. (5774548).

Art Unit: 2132

Figure 2 of Bando et al. shows two encryption devices working on intermediate keys as well as a scrambler.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 1-7 and 120-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski in view of Bando et al.

The above-cited references can be combined to show all of the claimed elements with Wasilewski being the primary reference and the increased security of a tiered encryption standard taught by Bando et al. being the motivation to combine.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas J. Meislahn whose telephone number is (703) 305-1338. The examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 6 PM, from Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gail Hayes can be reached on (703) 305-9711. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-0040 for regular communications and (703) 308-0040 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2132

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



DJM

September 2, 2001

Douglas J. Meislahn  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2132



**GAIL HAYES**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**